< ㇳ゚ > as Ainu Identity Marker? Gauging Resonance from an Examination of Speech-Contest Scripts

BRENES, Ivan

Abstract: Writing systems have at times transcended their practical functions and become icons of the people who use them. Similarly, an individual graphemic element of a writing system can be "branded" (Sebba, 2015) as a cultural identity marker. The paper explores this dimension of the sociolinguistics of orthography regarding the grapheme < ㇳ゚> (/tu/) of the Ainu language of Japan. We primarily conduct a quantitative corpus survey of published speech-contest scripts (1997–2018) in order to determine in how many scripts and in what contexts < ㇳ゚> is used. In particular, as we are interested in graphemic choice, we focus on the scripts drafted for the contest division that features speeches of original content (*benron*) rather than on those speeches derived from traditional sources. In this division, the vast majority of people (93%) chose the alternative < ㇳ ゥ> over < ㇳ゚>, suggesting that < ㇳ゚> has little resonance as an identity marker in this speech-contest setting. The paper discusses some of the possible reasons for this.

Key words: orthography of sociolinguistics, grapheme, identity marker

Introduction

On top of their communicative functions, the writing systems of civilizations and communities have often served as prominent identity markers of their respective groups. Some of this symbolism has been imbued with religion; the Arabic abjad, for example, is highly representative of the sacred scriptures of Islam. Other scripts such as Greek and Chinese are readily recognized emblems because of their socio-historical heft. On a more localized level, the scripts of North American indigenous groups and West African societies, although more obscure, also serve as markers of "who we are." Such resonance can also extend to graphemes: "Equally strong symbolism may attach to individual letters or characters, especially in cases where group identity or boundaries are at stake."[1] As with scripts, the extent of familiarity varies. For instance, the German letter <ß> and the Spanish <ñ> are international icons of German-ness and Hispanic culture, respectively, while regionally the <k> of Basque and the digraph <ŀl> of Catalan distance these languages from Spanish on the Iberian Peninsula. Some of this involves what Sebba (2015) has termed "branding,"

1) Sebba, 2001, p. 670

or a process of constructed symbolism whereby a grapheme is deliberately chosen to represent a group of people.[2)]

Effective branding should, of course, entail in its nascent stages a sustained interest in embracing a grapheme as an identity marker. This paper will attempt to discern whether in Japan such interest exists in the katakana character <ㇳ゚> among language enthusiasts who care about promoting Ainu in a speech-language setting. Ainu is conventionally written in both the Roman alphabet and the Japanese katakana script, but the grapheme <ㇳ゚> is today unique to Ainu. It stands for /tu/, a combination of phonemes that does not exist in standard Japanese and that is otherwise expressed by <ト ゥ> in the case of loanwords. Although its use originated among ethnic Japanese (*wajin*), <ㇳ゚> has been used in the past by prominent Ainu to distance the language from Japanese.

In this paper, we examine the scripts submitted by the contestants of an annual Ainu-language speech contest. We conduct a straightforward quantitative corpus analysis by counting the number of scripts with <ㇳ゚> and <ト ゥ>. These scripts are printed in the program handouts distributed to attendees on the day of the speech contest; they are also published post-contest in an annual report by the Foundation for Research and Promotion of Ainu Culture, a government-funded organization that hosts and sponsors the contests. Although the total number of scripts examined were for those speech contests that took place from 1997 (the year of the first contest) to 2018, our focus will be on a corpus of 97 scripts of *original* content composed by participants for the contest's oratorical division for 2001–2018 (the division was created in 2001). The reason for emphasizing these scripts is two-fold. First, the speech-contest scripts represent one of the few instances where original writings in Ainu are regularly put to paper by a range of non-specialists, both Ainu and non-Ainu. Second, the smaller corpus of original speeches contrasts with those of the other divisions, which usually draw from documented traditional narratives; a key assumption, then, is that these scripts more faithfully reflect the orthographic choices of the participants.[3)]

This paper will first present an overview of the "sociolinguistics of orthography" with regards to the symbolism of writing systems and graphemes. This will then be followed by an introduction to the Ainu language, plus a brief history of its writing conventions and those of the character <ㇳ゚>. We will then delve into our review of the speech contest and the aforementioned scripts, a study whose interpretations will ultimately be somewhat speculative as the approach is indirect and no interviews were conducted with contest participants. Nevertheless, this paper adds to the descriptive research on the branding of graphemes. The scripts can help us gauge attitudes on graphemic choices among those most motivated to compose content of their own choosing in a tongue no

2) Sebba, 2015

3) The children's division of the speech contest does include some original speeches, however.

longer spoken as a first language.

The Cultural Symbolism of Writing Systems

The iconicity of writing systems is a core area of study in the "sociolinguistics of orthography." Writing systems — "with long histories and strong national, regional, religious and cultural associations" — exhibit a solid tendency to become identity markers of the communities that use them.[4] As Sebba (2007) reminds us, "Orthography is *par excellence* a matter of language and culture."[5] Given the primacy of sacred texts in the expansion of the major religions, for example, writing systems have often proven to be religiously iconic. The Arabic script is an unmistakable symbol of Islam and the words of Allah, which is why devout Muslims resist translations and transliterations of the Qur'an. The Cyrillic alphabet is tied to Orthodox Christianity, and there are powerful associations between the Hebrew script and Judaism, the Ge'ez script and the Ethiopic Church, Devanagari and Hinduism, and the Tibetan writing system and Buddhism.[6] Scripts also resonate politically and nationalistically. In 1928, Turkey notably distanced itself from its Ottoman past by dropping the Arabic script in favor of the Roman alphabet, a shift that represented a cultural orientation towards Europe. In its literacy campaigns of the 1920s, the emergent Soviet Union had its Central Asian republics switch from the Arabic script to the more global Roman alphabet, all to dissociate them from their own historical writings as well as to dilute ties to Turkey and the Islamic sphere. This policy was followed by another mandated shift in the 1930s, this time to the Cyrillic alphabet to facilitate Russification and promote national unity. After the 1991 fall of the Soviet Union, Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan, and Moldova changed their official writing systems to the Roman alphabet to signal a break from their Soviet pasts and an opening to the West and beyond.[7] Thus, in addition to their utilitarian roles, writing systems have clearly served as major tools of religious and political alignment.

On a smaller scale, writing systems can also be employed by speakers of regional and minority languages to assert independent identities vis-a-vis a more dominant language:

> The establishment of symbolic distance from neighboring languages is particularly pertinent in situations of language endangerment where threatened varieties struggle to gain status and

4) Sebba, 2001, p. 82; see Sebba (2001) for an introduction to the orthography of sociolinguistics.

5) Sebba, 2007, p. 7

6) Sebba, 2001; Coulmas, 2013; see also Fishman (1977) for other European examples of where religion has driven orthographic changes

7) Henze, 1977; Sebba, 2001; Hogan-Brun & Melnyk, 2012

> legitimacy. Since language shift frequently emerges as a result of colonization, endangered speech communities may seek to create ideological independence from former colonial powers by using orthographical conventions that are maximally distinct from those of the language of wider communication.[8)]

Examples of distinct writing systems that have been embraced by minority groups include Sequoyah's indigenous script of the Cherokee, the Canadian aboriginal syllabics of the Cree and Inuktitut, and the Vai and N'ko scripts of West Africa, used for several Niger-Congo languages; the extent of vitality and literacy varies, but the systems at their core reflect a desire by their inventors and adaptors to differentiate the languages from internationally and regionally dominant languages, as well as to endow them with the prestige of a writing system.[9)]

Individual graphemes or diacritics can also be pressed into service as icons of identity. This can be the result of what Sebba (2015) has termed "branding," that is, "a process whereby a specific visual/graphical element of written language such as an alphabetic character becomes emblematic of a group of people who use that element in their writing practices."[10)] Sebba adds that branding is usually done by the in-group, the people who use the grapheme and writing system, and who actively want to visually contrast their language from others. This popular acceptance of graphemic symbols can involve letters common across many orthographies. The brandings behind opting for <c> or <k> to represent /k/ are especially well known in the literature on orthographies, although they are largely opaque to those outside the relevant communities. Euskara (Basque) and Mayan languages in Guatemala, for instance, drop <c> in favor of <k> to establish distance from dominant Spanish. In addition, Flemish speakers in Belgium prefer <k> over <c> in French loan words (for example, *kultuur vs cultuur*) to differentiate the terms from French. In contrast, Dutch in the Netherlands features <c> instead because <k> predominates in German.[11)]

Of course, language communities tend to gravitate to graphemes that are eye-catching or unique to their writing systems.[12)] Thus, Spanish speakers and Germans have embraced <ñ> and <ß>, respectively, as identity markers of language and culture [extending over the double n's, the tilde (˜) is even part of the CNN logo design for Spanish-language services].[13)] In Scandinavia, the Danish letters <æ> and <ø> contrast with the corresponding letters of <ä> and <ö> in Swedish, in part

8) Jones & Mooney, 2017, p. 25

9) West Africa is especially rich with local writing systems. See: Kotei, 1977; Unseth, 2011; Moseley, 2017

10) Sebba, 2015, pps. 6–7

11) Sebba, 2007; Hull, 2017; Hewitt, 2017; Geerts, et.al., 1977

12) Seifart, 2006

13) Maurais, 2003; Coulmas, 2013

because of historical rancor (the distinctive <ø> has also grown into a popular Scandinavian emblem throughout the world). Azerbaijan has put its iconic <ə> — also the third letter in the country's name — on its banknotes as a way of marking its re-adoption of the Roman alphabet and of distinguishing its orthography from those of other Turkic languages.[14] Naturally, such loyalty to letters becomes even more fervent if any threat to the graphemes is perceived, as when Germany's orthographic reform of 1996 replaced <ß> with <ss> after short vowels. This change became an especially bitter point of contention, lending the grapheme ideological currency as a "brand" of proper German orthography.[15]

In minority-language communities that wish to assert cultural independence, distinctive graphemes carry extra resonance. Thus, the aforementioned ligature <ŀl> of Catalan (used for a lengthened /l/) distances that language from Spanish. For the Tuareg of north Africa, the grapheme *yaz* <ⵣ> of the Tifinagh script symbolizes a "free man" and is featured on the Berber flag. In Cameroon, the barred u <ʉ> of the Bamileke languages (used to designate a high central vowel) serves as a cultural marker that distinguishes them from other regional languages.[16] Even ancient Mayan glyphs — mostly "read" symbolically in books, posters and logos — are undergoing a revival as part of a robust reaffirmation of Mayan identity in present-day Guatemala.[17]

These languages are minority tongues, and in-group use of the writing systems and graphemes varies widely. For example, displays of and publications in Catalan are widespread as the language boasts 10 million speakers and enjoys official recognition. The Tifinagh script, on the other hand, is far less utilized for writing informative content, although it is valued for its symbolism and there are revitalization campaigns to boost its use.[18] A writing system as identity marker can even resonate among people with limited fluency in a language, as is the case with the Cherokee in the United States (a situation which echoes that of the Ainu). Outgroup familiarity with iconic graphemes also varies. Many North Americans and Europeans are familiar with a number of Greek letters, and they quickly associate <ñ> with Spanish. However, familiarity with individual graphemes naturally diminishes the more regional a language is.

In the case of Ainu, few people outside of enthusiasts and scholars can speak or read the language. The majority *wajin* know little about the Ainu language, much less its writing system, and the syllabic character < ㇱ> is, on the whole, opaque in Japan. The question we will explore is

14) Sebba, 2015

15) Spitzmüller, 2012

16) Bird, 2001; see also Lüpke, 2011

17) Holbrock, 2016

18) Sebba, 2007; Sadiqi, 2011; Moseley, 2017

whether < ㇱ> has some currency as an icon among those who study, use, and promote the Ainu language.

The Writing Conventions of Ainu and the Emergence of < ㇱ >

The Ainu language today is classified as "critically endangered."[19] Its dialects were spoken from the Kurile Islands and the southern part of Sakhalin to Japan's island of Hokkaido. The Ainu were hunter gatherers who traded extensively with their neighbors. In the south, this trade eventually expanded into networks that spurred the 15th-century rise of Japanese settlements along the coast of southern Hokkaido. The Tokugawa Era (1602–1868) saw the local Japanese ruling clan come to economically dominate the indigenous Ainu, although fundamental cultural changes came after 1868 when the new Meiji government officially declared Hokkaido part of the emerging Japanese nation-state. Large numbers of *wajin* then heeded the call to settle the northern frontier, and the Ainu soon found themselves driven off their traditional lands and forced into farming. By the dawn of the 20th century, Japan was enforcing assimilationist policies that, among other things, required Ainu children to be schooled solely in the Japanese language. This tore at the nexus of language and culture as students were shamed and punished for speaking Ainu. Under the duress of countless discriminatory and social pressures, inter-generational transmission of the language withered.[20]

Commonly mentioned Ainu population figures of 25,000 or so are based on former surveys in Hokkaido, but many experts agree that these estimates are quite conservative as they do not include people living outside Hokkaido as well as those who conceal their origins; the real number could be double or more.[21] There are no longer any first-language speakers of Ainu, and the language is considered extinct as a form of daily, spontaneous communication.[22] Nevertheless, political activism since the 1970s has resulted in increased affirmation of culture and identity among the Ainu with a resultant boost in the numbers of second-language learners of Ainu.

Ainu is considered a language isolate with no known linguistic relatives, but it does share some linguistic features with its neighbor, Japanese (also a language isolate).[23] For example, it is an SOV language with a common word order of Subject-Object-Verb, it features postpositions rather than

19) *UNESCO Interactive Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger* (unesco.org)

20) Heinrich, 2012

21) De Chicchis, 1995; Maher, 2001

22) Heinrich, 2012; Refsing, 2014

23) Shibatani, 1990

prepositions, and it has a simple phonological system (five vowels and 12 consonants). However, the morphology is quite different from Japanese: There is an extensive use of personal affixes in Ainu, and there are no verb inflections. In addition, verbs and adjectives are not distinguished. The affixes point to the polysynthetic nature of the language, or the adding of morphemes to make complex words, a linguistic trait much more pronounced in "classical Ainu" – the language used in traditional performances – than in spoken Ainu. Although Ainu does share with Japanese a simple phonology, there are some notable differences here as well. Unlike Japanese, Ainu does not generally distinguish between voiced and voiceless consonants, and its lexemes can end with stop consonants such as /t/, /p/, and /k/ (Japanese words end mostly with /N/). In addition, the sound /tu/, which is represented by < ㇱ>, does not exist in standard Japanese; the closest sound would be the *tsu* sound, written <ツ> in katakana.[24)]

Today, Ainu is written in Roman letters, in a modified katakana script, or in both systems in tandem. There is no standardized orthography, although there are writing conventions which exhibit some variability. Academic linguists and other language scholars have in general preferred writing Ainu in Roman letters because phonetic and morphological features, such as the stop consonants and personal affixes, are more transparent.[25)] However, many Ainu and language learners have tended to favor katakana. Indeed, Shigeru Kayano, the eminent cultural and political leader of the Ainu, embraced katakana because the Ainu themselves were more used to writing in it.[26)] Those who prefer katakana continue to stress that, as katakana is already part of the Japanese writing system, it is easier to adopt and to use in order to express unfamiliar pronunciations. After all, the dominant language of speaking and literacy for present-day Ainu is Japanese, although those who identify as Ainu value written displays of Ainu. In this sense, the Ainu resemble many Tlingit of Alaska who "do not speak Tlingit or speak it marginally, but who use literacy for its decorative and symbolic effect or impression…"[27)]

Up until the 19th century, the Ainu were for the most part preliterate with an extensive oral literature. Written expressions of Ainu began to appear as explorers and missionaries made their way into Ainu lands throughout the 17th and 18th centuries.[28)] Unsurprisingly, non-Japanese tended to write their content in the Roman alphabet.[29)] For example, it was an Italian Jesuit who penned the first list of Ainu words in Roman letters after visits to Hokkaido in 1618 and 1621. In the late 19th

24) Labrune, 2012

25) Nakagawa, 1995; Nakagawa, 2006; Tamura, 2013

26) Nakagawa, 2006

27) Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer, 1998, p. 89

28) Tamura, 1999

29) Those who recorded the language in Russian territories used the Cyrillic alphabet.

century, the first grammar and dictionary of Ainu were published by an English missionary, John Batchelor, who also translated the Bible into Ainu; he did all his writing in Roman letters.

The first people to use katakana for writing Ainu were the ethnic Japanese who were employed in Hokkaido as interpreters and translators during the Tokugawa Era (1602–1868). These *Ezo tsūji* translated Japanese documents into Ainu for purposes of trade, and their records, although in varied katakana styles, have continued to influence subsequent katakana renderings of Ainu to the present day.[30] As sometimes happens when people encounter unfamiliar sounds, *wajin* translators had to find syllabic graphemes for expressing Ainu syllables that did not exist in Japanese. One of these syllables was /tu/ (pronounced "two"), a sound which appears in such Ainu words as *atuy* ("ocean"), *attus* (traditional clothing made of elm fiber), and *tunakai* ("reindeer"). Graphemes such as <ヅ>, <ド>, <ト>, and <ド> were drawn on to represent /tu/. The last two were probably abandoned because of confusion with their Japanese pronunciations of /to/ and /do/, respectively; in addition, documents with the other two more distinctive graphemes garnered more credence as those interested inferred that the authors had more knowledge of things Ainu.[31] The grapheme <ヅ> enjoyed some frequent use from the start; famed explorer and geographer Mogami Tokunai, for example, used both <ヅ> and <ド> in his writings. However, <ヅ> eventually became rarer and is today extinct.

The grapheme <ド> continued to gain prominence as it had been adopted by another notable explorer of Hokkaido, Shimanojo Murakami (1760–1808), for writing Ainu words and names in his travel journals.[32] It also had the advantage of representing unambiguously one pronunciation.[33] Indeed, the phonemic combination /tu/ had also been part of the phonology of the standard Middle Chinese spoken during the Tang Dynasty (618–907), and in their records of writings from the Tang Dynasty, Japanese scribes had already used <ド> to convey a /tu/ pronunciation.[34] Hōsei Nagata (1838–1911), a Meiji-era educator, also chose <ド> when writing his dictionary on place names of Ainu origin.[35] The character was later taken up in the 20th century by the first ethnic-Ainu linguist, Mashiho Chiri, who used it in his *Introduction to the Ainu Language* (1956) and *A Small Dictionary of Ainu Place Names* (1956). Of more impact, however, was Shigeru Kayano (1926–2006), the aforementioned Ainu elder and political leader. Although Kayano had at times also used <ト゜ゥ>, he features <ド> in several of his major works such as *Kayano's Ainu Dictionary* (1962, 1996), and

30) Nakagawa, 2006

31) Sato, 1995

32) Tanaka, 1989

33) Sato, 1995

34) Numoto, 1990

35) Nagata, 1891

Kayano's Collections of the Stories of Gods (1998). In addition, in 1983, Kayano had established the first Ainu-language school in the Hokkaido town of Nibutani, and the school's language textbook, *Yasashii Ainugo* (*Ainu Language Made Easy*), was printed with ＜ㇷ゚＞; he also consistently wrote ＜ㇷ゚＞ in the classroom.[36] Kayano even had ＜ㇷ゚＞ used in the title of his publication of documents from his court case against the construction of the Nibutani Dam on sacred Ainu lands [significantly, ＜ㇷ゚＞ is used in the word *tun* (トゥンㇷ゚), or "two persons," emphasizing that it was a pair of ethnic Ainu who initiated the landmark 1989 lawsuit].[37] It is clear that Kayano attempted to distance the Ainu writing system from Japanese writing conventions.[38] Shiro Kayano, Kayano's son and noted language activist, also used ＜ㇷ゚＞ in his teaching materials when he hosted an Ainu-language radio program in 2007 (as have a few other radio instructors).[39] Other notable people who have used ＜ㇷ゚＞ in their written works include the *wajin* Ainu-rights activist Pon Fuchi (Fusako Nogami), Ainu cultural leader Tasuke Yamamoto, and the Ainu musician Masanori Toyo'oka; indeed, Toyo'oka himself goes by the Ainu name アトゥイ (*Atuy*, or "ocean"), which was also the title of a memoir of his (アトゥイ).[40]

Overall, the grapheme ＜ㇷ゚＞ has been embraced by it users because of its legacy of use since the Tokugawa Era and because it follows the common Japanese syllabic convention of one katakana character denoting one syllable, as seen in /ta/=＜タ＞ and /da/=＜ダ＞, for example; in addition, its distinctiveness accentuates the fact that its underlining sound does not exist in standard Japanese.[41] Opposition to ＜ㇷ゚＞ had previously been based in part on the technical challenges of printing ＜ㇷ゚＞ with word-processing technology that featured standard Japanese graphemes, but this argument has become moot since the inclusion of ＜ㇷ゚＞ in Unicode in 2002 and in JIS (Japanese Industrial Standards, the computer encoding system for Japanese characters).

In the 1970s, however, more people such as Ainu scholar Mie Haginaka came to recommend the writing of /tu/ as ＜トゥ＞ because of widespread unfamiliarity with ＜ㇷ゚＞, the established practice of writing loanwords in Japanese with ＜トゥ＞, and perceived doubts on how to pronounce ＜ㇷ゚＞.[42] Since then, ＜トゥ＞ has to a great extent supplanted ＜ㇷ゚＞ in academic and popular katakana writings of Ainu. For example, when the Ainu Association of Hokkaido (*Hokkaido Utari Kyōkai*), the most prominent political organization of Ainu, gathered language specialists and activists to publish the

36) Kukazawa, 2019

37) Kayano & Tanaka, 1999

38) Nakagawa, 2006

39) Shiro Kayano was also an editor of *Yasashii Ainugo.*

40) Atuy, 2002

41) Nakagawa, 2006

42) Nakagawa, 2006

first Ainu language textbook, *Akor Itak,* in 1994, it chose to adopt <ㇳゥ>. The book has been a major influence on Ainu orthographic norms in both katakana script and Roman letters, although it does include <ㇳ゜> in a passage from Kayano's works.[43] In addition, the Foundation for the Research and Promotion of Ainu Culture, the major public entity promoting the Ainu language, tends to use <ㇳゥ> in its publications, and the new National Ainu Museum, which opened in Shiraoi in 2020, uses <ㇳゥ> in its renderings of Ainu words. An Ainu-language newsletter (*Ainu Times*) and many Ainu language-learning materials, such as Nakagawa's *Ekusupuresu Ainugo* (*Express Ainu*), also employ <ㇳゥ>.

As a result, present-day displays and printings of <ㇳ゜> are much more sporadic compared to <ㇳゥ>, although a notable mention is Sapporo Pirka Kotan ("beautiful village"), an Ainu cultural center and museum run by the city of Sapporo. It features <ㇳ゜> in its exhibit labels.

The Ainu-Language Speech Contest

The 1970s and 1980s saw Ainu cultural resurgence and political activism that boosted language awareness and pride. One outcome was the Japanese government's 1997 passing of the Law for the Promotion of Ainu Culture, a law designed to sponsor and advance cultural studies and language revitalization efforts. The Foundation for the Research and Promotion of Ainu Culture (hereafter, The Foundation for Ainu Culture, or The Foundation) was established under this law. The Foundation is a public organization that funds language promotion activities such as the training of language instructors, the publication of language teaching materials, the broadcasting of Ainu language courses on STV Radio in Hokkaido, and the holding of language classes in Tokyo and in several locations throughout Hokkaido.[44] It has offices in Sapporo and Tokyo.

The Foundation for Ainu Culture also organizes and hosts an Ainu-language speech contest. The Ainu-Language Speech Contest is called *itak=an ro* ("Let's speak Ainu," or *Ainu-go Benron Taikai* in Japanese).[45] The first Ainu-Language Speech Contest was on 3 October 1997, and the contest has been held every year since then, with the exceptions of 2012 (no contest) and 2013 (two contests, one held in February and the other in October). The event has largely taken place in western Hokkaido, with recent venues mainly in Sapporo or Chitose. The first speech contest consisted of nine speeches. The contest grew from a half-day event to an all-day affair as the number of partici-

43) Nakagawa, 2006

44) Maher, 2001

45) Much of what is discussed about the speech contests is based on an examination of The Foundation's *Report on the Ainu Language Speech Contest ITAK AN RO* for the contests of 1997–2018 as well as the author's experience of attending four speech contests.

pants has grown. There was a peak of 49 speeches and 55 participants in the 20th contest of 2016; the 22nd contest (2018) saw 26 speeches with 33 participants. Most speeches in *itak=an ro* are sole performances, but some have been delivered by two or more contestants, and even by groups. Most people come from Hokkaido, but almost every contest has seen one or more contestants from other parts of Japan, mostly from the Kantō region. Participants range from pre-school children to elders, and both Ainu and non-Ainu are eligible to enter (many participants identify themselves as Ainu in their speeches, and a smaller number identify themselves as *wajin* or non-Japanese). Scholars of the Ainu language are barred from participating. They, along with Ainu elders and language teachers, often serve as judges who award points based on such factors as pronunciation, delivery, content, and use of language. *Itak=an ro* is open to the general public, and the audience number has usually been in the range of 100−200 people. The event is well-known among the Ainu as well as among relevant scholars and activists. The contest is regarded as a celebration of Ainu culture and language, but it is largely unknown to the Japanese public.

There were no distinctions among the speeches in the first two contests. From the third speech contest (1999), non-contestant performances by guest speakers, often respected members of Ainu communities, have been held while the judges select the winners; these performances are included in the totals here. The first four speech contests included a mix of traditional and original works, but the fifth speech contest of 2001 was divided into two categories: 1) the "oral literature division," which accounts for the vast majority of speeches and draws on traditional sources, and 2) the "oratorical division" (*benron*), which is comprised of expository and persuasive speeches of original content that are judged on "compositional and organization skills." The 11th speech contest (2007) included for the first time a "children's division" of mostly traditionally based content with some original performances.

Although we have used the term "speech" for each listed performance on the contest stage, we need to remember that most "speeches" are recitals based on *yukar* (traditional epic narrative) passages, folk tales, and traditional songs. For the casual observer, the term "speech" is perhaps best captured by what takes place in the oratorical division (hereafter referred to as the "*benron* division" to mark a sharper contrast with the "oral literature division"). Participants are free to choose the content for the *benron* division, and the speeches often discuss topics such as personal experiences, reflections on Ainu language and culture, current social and environmental issues, Hokkaido's colonial legacy, and individual hopes for the future.

Contestants who apply to enter the contest must submit a script of their planned speech in Ainu plus a Japanese translation of the contents, about two months before the contest. Particularly since the fourth contest, sources are generally cited for non-original speeches. The content and written

presentation are left up to the participant, and it is unclear from the reports examined how much assistance is received, whether from Ainu speakers or teachers, when presenters draft their speeches. The scripts are then printed on the programs that are distributed to attendees on the day of the speech contest. In addition, The Foundation for Ainu Culture publishes the scripts in their annual *Ainu-go Benron Taikai Hōkokushō* (*Report on the Ainu-Language Speech Contest*), which can then be accessed by interested parties in academic libraries around Japan.[46] While the programs and reports hardly qualify as materials of recreational reading, the author has observed that listeners on the day of the presentations *do* read the program and presumably follow the Ainu and Japanese translations along with the speech in progress. This is understandable as comprehension levels are low; even for those who study conversational Ainu in classes, the classical Ainu of traditional story-telling is quite opaque. Thus, although contest attendance may be relatively modest and overall readership of the scripts is limited, there is an element of display in the compositions done for an event that celebrates ethnic pride in the Ainu language (and where, in fact, many participants wear traditional Ainu dress when they deliver their speeches and sing their songs).

< ㇵ゚ > in Language-Contest Scripts: Findings and Discussion

For this paper, a corpus analysis of the scripts in each *Report on the Ainu-Language Speech Contest* was conducted for the years 1997–2018. Reports were accessed at the Sapporo offices of The Foundation for Ainu Culture, the main library at Hokkaido University, and the National Museum of Ethnology in Osaka. The quantitative scope was fairly straightforward: The Ainu scripts were systematically read and the number of scripts were tabulated according to writing system and grapheme used (< ㇵ゚> or < ト ゥ>). A qualitative survey was also done by reading and checking the Japanese translations for contestants of interest.

An overview of our quantitative findings for the full corpus of contest scripts is partially presented in Table 1. A total of 644 speeches (and 760 speakers) were counted in the 22 speech contests held between 1997 and 2018; of this number, 307 (47.7%) of the scripts were written solely in katakana, 101 (15.7%) were written solely in Roman letters (*Romaji*), and 234 (36.3%) were written in both katakana and Roman letters.[47] Thus, a total of 541 scripts bore katakana, and of

46) The programs list the speeches planned for the day of the speech contest, but there are sometimes cancellations. The scripts of cancelled speeches are not published in the reports.

47) In the traditional speeches, each script usually includes the speaker's introductory comments, and writing system and graphemic choices usually align with those of the body. However, one speaker had written the introduction in katakana with the body of the speech in Roman letters; this script was recorded as a Romanized script. In addition, one script for the children's division was in hiragana, and one guest-speaker "speech" consisted of a spontaneous conversation without a script.

Table 1 Number of Speeches and Scripts from Ainu-Language Speech Contests (1997–2018)

Contest No.	Year	Total Speeches	Scripts with *Romaji**	Scripts with Katakana*	Scripts with < ト ゥ >	Scripts with < ㇷ゚>
1	1997	9	5	7	4	2
2	1998	13	0	13	9	5
3	1999	18	7	15	12	3
4	2000	15	6	9	9	0
5	2001	15	6	12	10	1
6	2002	19	9	15	11	3
7	2003	29	15	24	14	7
8	2004	26	15	22	14	6
9	2005	31	17	29	16	13
10	2006	31	17	27	19	5
11	2007	33	23	25	13	10
12	2008	37	11	34	20	14
13	2009	49	31	32	21	9
14	2010	29	25	29	19	9
15	2011	27	16	20	10	6
16	2013	45	26	34	18	11
17	2013	25	14	21	10	6
18	2014	40	18	35	14	17
19	2015	37	20	31	17	10
20	2016	49	19	46	27	17
21	2017	41	23	38	22	15
22	2018	26	12	23	13	8
Total		644	335	541	322	177

*The figures include scripts drafted in both writing systems.

these, 177 (32.7%) exhibited < ㇷ゚> and 322 (59.3%) used < ト ゥ >.[48] As for the grapheme < ㇷ゚>, we can see a marked increase in its appearance in the years 2002–2003 (from three to seven scripts), and then < ㇷ゚> maintains an appreciable presence in the annual script counts with peaks in 2014 and 2016 (17 scripts each).

Our findings from an examination of the *benron* corpus are presented in Table 2. In our sample of 2001–2018 (as was mentioned, 2001 is the year the division was formed), there were 97 speeches in the *benron* section delivered by a total of 73 individuals (some, of course, with repeat performances) and two groups of 11 people (2006) and six people (2011); 56 (58%) of the scripts were written in Roman letters (either alone or in parallel with katakana) while 66 (68%) were written in

48) It should be noted that a few scripts did not feature any words with /tu/. In addition, three scripts were found to mix both < ㇷ゚> and < ト ゥ > in their bodies; these scripts were counted twice. Finally, one Ainu script was in Roman lettering but < ㇷ゚> appeared in Ainu words used in the Japanese translation; this script was not counted as one where < ㇷ゚> was used.

Table 2 Number of Speeches and Scripts from the Oratorical (*Benron*) Division of Ainu-Language Speech Contests (1997–2018)

Contest No.	Year	*Benron* Speeches	*Benron* Scripts in *Romaji**	*Benron* Scripts in Katakana*	*Benron* Scripts with <ト゚ゥ>	*Benron* Scripts with <ㇷ゚>
1	1997	–	–	–	–	–
2	1998	–	–	–	–	–
3	1999	–	–	–	–	–
4	2000	–	–	–	–	–
5	2001	3	1	3	3	0
6	2002	7	2	6	5	1
7	2003	7	3	5	3	0
8	2004	6	3	4	4	0
9	2005	10	3	8	6	2
10	2006	6	3	5	4	0
11	2007	10	7	6	6	0
12	2008	4	3	2	2	0
13	2009	5	3	3	3	0
14	2010	4	4	4	4	0
15	2011	7	6	2	1	1
16	2013	5	2	3	2	1
17	2013	4	2	3	3	0
18	2014	3	1	2	0	2
19	2015	2	2	0	0	0
20	2016	8	5	7	7	0
21	2017	4	4	3	3	0
22	2018	2	2	0	0	0
Total		97	56	66	56	7

*The figures include scripts drafted in both writing systems.

katakana (either alone or in parallel with the Roman alphabet). As for <ㇷ゚>, the grapheme appeared in only 7 of the 97 scripts, accounting for a modest 7.2% of all *benron* scripts and 10.6% of the 66 katakana scripts. In addition, <ㇷ゚> did not appear in the *benron* division in the last four speech contests (2015–2018).

From the outset, the contrast in numbers in both tables highlights a lower participation in the *benron* division as these performances accounted for only 15% of all contest speeches. This is unsurprising. The organizing and drafting of original content in Ainu entails considerable time and effort; Ainu is no longer spoken as a living language, and careful attention must be paid to the correct use of grammatical and standard lexical items (as well as the formation of neologisms).[49)]

49) Kukazawa, 2019

Language students would need considerable assistance from their teachers. It is much easier to compose a speech based on already published sources. Incidentally, on script choice, both tables also appear to confirm a preference among non-scholars for writing Ainu in the katakana script, as predicted by Nakagawa and others.[50)]

Focusing on our katakana graphemes, we find that the appearance of < ㇵ゚> is much more robust in the speeches of the children's division and oral literature division. Indeed, a substantial third of the katakana scripts in all *itak=an ro* used < ㇵ゚>. In contrast, the grapheme appeared in only 7 of the 97 *benron* scripts, accounting for a modest 7.2% of all *benron* scripts and 10.6% of the 66 *benron* katakana scripts. The breakdown of the scripts from the *benron* division suggests little interest in branding < ㇵ゚> as a marker of Ainu identity. Again, we arrive at this reasoning because we assume that the original content of the *benron* speeches sheds light on orthographic choices; the speakers, after all, have the freedom to choose how to visually present their *itak=an ro* speeches, and while there is some original content in other speeches, such as in the children's division, it is assumed that choices in the *benron* division are made by the adult speakers themselves. However, we cannot account for the sparsity of < ㇵ゚> without ethnographic research into the reasons why participants made the choices that they made (nor can we determine how other contestants feel about the *potential* of < ㇵ゚> as identity marker).

Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to assume that where contestants freely chose to include < ㇵ゚> in scripts composed by their own hand, the choice was not arbitrary and the grapheme serves as an identity marker for *some* people. A qualitative survey reveals that in the seven *benron* scripts with < ㇵ゚>, one individual identified as Ainu, one identified as Japanese, and one speech was delivered by the abovementioned group of six people (three parents and three children). The contestant who self-identified as Ainu presented two speeches (in 2013 and 2014), which means that five individuals and one group chose to write their scripts with < ㇵ゚> (however, some members of the group presentation had studied Ainu in the Nibutani school under Shiro Kayano, which may explain why they used the character). These *benron* < ㇵ゚> scripts covered a number of topics such as personal discoveries of Ainu culture, work experience with Ainu organizations, explanations about *yukar*, and performance experiences playing the *mukkuri* (a traditional musical instrument similar to a jaw harp). The self-identified Ainu who used < ㇵ゚> twice explained that she was from Ainu Kotan in Akan, a town in eastern Hokkaido that is home to one of the largest Ainu communities on the island. Her two speeches discussed her community, the environmental legacies of the famous Marimo festival, Ainu history, and her experiences of dancing and singing in the local theater.

50) Nakagawa, 2016

A closer look at the use of < ㇵ゚> in the scripts of contests predating the *benron* division suggests that, as is seen in the *benron* division, there are idiosyncratic impulses that are sparse but not negligible. In the second *itak=an ro* of 1998, one user delivered a memorable plea to revive the *iyomante*, a traditional ceremony in which a bear cub is sacrificed to symbolically send its spirit back to the world of the gods. In addition, since the 16th speech contest, a few participants in the children's division have delivered original speeches with scripts displaying < ㇵ゚>. One speech in the 2018 *itak=an ro*, the last contest in our sample, was made by a music band of adolescents that sang songs in Ainu played to modern music [they returned the next year (2019) for the 23rd speech contest with more music and a second script with < ㇵ゚>].

There are also ethnic Japanese who have used < ㇵ゚> in original scripts. Indeed, the first speech contest featured a *wajin* contestant who held up a large card bearing < ㇵ゚> as she explained how her first encounter with the character two decades before in a museum exhibit had sparked her interest in Ainu.[51] Interestingly, the Japanese adopter of < ㇵ゚> in the *benron* division, a university student at the time, explained how she became interested in studying the Ainu language through her studies of Ireland and of the language-endangerment parallels between Ainu and Irish.

In the end, though, we find more speeches that solidly affirm Ainu culture and language among non-users of < ㇵ゚>. Why is < ㇵ゚> not more salient in the scripts for the *benron* division compared to other sections of *itak=an ro*? A number of sociolinguistic factors present themselves for consideration. The first could be a strong association, gleaned from a participant's review of Ainu-language materials, between Shigeru Kayano and the grapheme, or between Classical Ainu and the grapheme. The speeches of the children's division and oral literature division present more challenges for discerning choice regarding writing systems and graphemes because most of the speeches in these divisions draw on published sources. A significant number of presenters would presumedly follow the styles of the cited authors. For example, in the years 2001–2018, there were a total of 332 speeches in the traditional oral literature division, and 104 (31.3%) featured scripts with < ㇵ゚>. Kayano's works, particularly his *Collections of the Stories of Gods*, are cited as sources in 86 of the 104 scripts, or 83% (!) of the scripts with < ㇵ゚> in the oral literature division. As was mentioned, Kayano chose to use < ㇵ゚> in this work and other writings. This finding suggests that some presenters are simply following Kayano's orthographic styles. Alternatively, people could identify < ㇵ゚> with the Classical Ainu of the *yukar*, a language that is quite distinct in morphology, syntax and vocabulary from that of spoken Ainu. Thus, speakers might find that the more enigmatic < ㇵ゚> complements the distant traditional language more than the colloquial Ainu we find in personal

51) Her script was Romanized, although she would use < ㇵ゚> in a katakana script in the next speech contest. The pertinent report features a photograph of the speaker displaying her card.

speeches.

Second, the speech-contest setting itself also entails a number of elements that detract from the visual promotion of written elements. Speaking events have become more visible in minority-language communities worldwide as measures to promote the speaking and study of marginalized languages. The contests can range from major events like the week-long National Eisteddod of Wales, with its readings of Welsh poems, to the more small-scale endeavors of Lakota, Quechua and Ryukyuan speakers.[52] The *itak=an ro* contest is a prime example of these language revitalization efforts (plus, the Japanese have a long scholastic tradition of holding speech contests for English and other prestigious languages). However, the speech contest elevates the uttered word over the written word, an aspect that harmonizes with Ainu's heritage of oral narratives. There is also the resultant scarcity of written materials due to the language's endangerment. As a result, contestants may be relatively indifferent to visual displays of writing as an identity marker. Correspondingly, we must remember that general readership of the contest programs and reports is almost certainly low. With materials of relatively little visibility, presenters might see script or graphemic choice as a factor of little cultural relevance in the event's context.

Finally, there is also the matter of orthographic distance from the main local language, Japanese. One line of reasoning suggests that for some people, the Ainu writing conventions may be distinctive enough to mark Ainu without < ㇰ゜>. Ainu's modified kana script is unique in itself with its set of smaller katakana characters used to indicate consonants (for example, <クク> represents / ku/ in Japanese and Ainu, but the smaller <ㇰ> stands for the /k/ consonant). In an interesting transposition, whereas Japanese employs katakana for foreign loanwords, most kana conventions of Ainu make use of kanji and hiragana for writing loan words from Japanese. The Roman alphabet is, of course, the stronger distancer. We have mentioned its advantages for clarifying pronunciation and word components to learners of Ainu, but the author is also familiar with Ainu-language activists and scholars who favor the alphabet for asserting a separate identity. Thus, the all-katakana script or the Roman alphabet may be iconic enough for some. The other line of thinking is that some contestants may find < ㇰ゜> too distant for comfort. *Itak=an ro* is a publicly sponsored event that is open to the general public, and in such a setting, some contestants might be hesitant to use a grapheme that is unfamiliar to Japanese audience members (similar sentiments were expressed to me by the staff at a Shiraoi museum as a reason for opting to use < ㇳ ㇴ> in exhibit labels). However, we should remember that all attendees have access to Japanese translations in the program pamphlets and that a fair number of participants readily used < ㇰ゜> in their scripts. Still, such overlying tensions in ortho-

52) King, 2001; Osumi, 2001; Henne-Ochoa & Bauman, 2015

graphic choices are not uncommon; for example, the raised dot (*punctum delens*) that indicated fricative consonants in the Irish Gaelic alphabet was replaced with <h> as part of twentieth-century reforms to facilitate the dissemination of printed Irish, although to this day symbolic use of the iconic diacritic persists.[53)]

To shed light on why <ㇵ゚> is not chosen more when drafting original contest scripts, an extended ethnographic study outside the scope of this paper would be required. For now, we can surmise that if activists or language planners wanted to brand <ㇵ゚> as an emblem of Ainu ethnicity, they will have to look beyond the confines of the page and the speech contest to more decorative displays of the grapheme. After all, Ainu do not read Ainu in their free time, but people are increasingly encountering Ainu katakana writing in, for example, the linguistic landscape – the display of writing in public and private signs – of locations with links to Ainu culture and heritage in Hokkaido. The alternative <ㇵ ㇰ> still predominates in this realm, though, and our study does not point to an emergent embrace of <ㇵ゚>.

Conclusion

The sociolinguistics of orthography shows us how writing systems and their individual elements can transcend their utilitarian roles and come to represent an intrinsic part of the identity of many groups. The most unique graphemes often carry the most branding, that is, the most recognition and the most in-group support. However, our examination of the use of the Ainu grapheme <ㇵ゚> in the participant scripts for the annual Ainu-Language Speech Contest suggests that <ㇵ゚> has little resonance as an identity marker. Although <ㇵ゚> appears in about a third of all scripts that display katakana, it is difficult to discern preferences as many people were probably following the conventions of their cited sources. Focusing on katakana scripts of original content, the vast majority (93%) of adults here chose <ㇵ ㇰ> over <ㇵ゚>; the appearance of <ㇵ゚> is limited to a few individuals and groups, young and older, who seem to echo the gestures of others before them who used <ㇵ゚> to distinguish Ainu from Japanese. There could be a number of reasons for this, including a stronger identification of <ㇵ゚> with the language of Shigeru Kayano and classical Ainu than with colloquial Ainu, the elevating of the spoken word over the written word in the contest's environment, and the question of how much orthographic distance is enough for cultural identity or how much graphemic distance is comfortable for people unfamiliar with <ㇵ゚>. Thus, this study ends with more questions than answers, and uncovering which reasons explain the low unprompted use of <ㇵ゚> hinges on

53) Murchú, 1977

future fieldwork with those who identify as Ainu. Over time, it will be interesting to see if more people come to find the distinctiveness of < ド> appealing enough that its visibility broadens beyond the limited usage indicated by our paper.

References

Ainu Association of Hokkaido. *Akor Itak* [*Our Language*]. Sapporo: Ainu Association of Hokkaido, 1994.

Atuy (Toyooka, Masanori). *Atuy - Ore ha tamashi wo dezain suru* [*Atuy: I Design My Spirit*] アドイ ―俺は魂をデザインする. Sapporo: Hokkaido Shimbunsha, 2002.

Bird, Steven. "Orthography and Identity in Cameroon." *Written Language and Literacy* 4:2 (2001): 131–162.

Chiri, Mashiho. *Ainugo nyumon* [*Introduction to the Ainu Language*] アイヌ語入門. Hokkaido: Hokkaido Shuppan Kikaku Senta, 1956.

Chiri, Mashiho. *Chimei Ainugo shojiten* [*A Small Dictionary of Ainu Places Names*] 地名アイヌ語小事典. Hokkaido: Hokkaido Shuppan Kikaku Senta, 1956.

Coulmas, Florian. *Writing and Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Dauenhauer, Nora Marks and Richard Dauenhauer. "Technical, emotional, and ideological issues in reversing language shift: examples from Southeast Alaska." In *Endangered languages: language loss and community response*. Eds. Lenore A. Grenoble and Lindsay J. Whaley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. 57–98.

De Chicchis, Joseph. "The current state of the Ainu language." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Education*, 16 (1995): 103–124.

Fishman, Joshua. "Advances in the Creation and Revision of Writing Systems." In *Advances in the Creation and Revision of Writing Systems*. Ed. Joshua Fishman. The Hague: De Gruyter, 1977. XI–XXVIII.

Foundation for the Research and Promotion of Ainu Culture. *Ainu-go benron taikai ITAK AN RO – Hōkokushō* [*Report on the Ainu Language Speech Contest ITAK AN RO*] アイヌ語弁論大会 ―報告書 (Nos. 1–22). Sapporo: Foundation for the Research and Promotion of Ainu Culture, 1998–2019.

Fukazawa, Mika. "Ainu Language and Ainu Speakers." In *Routledge Handbook of Japanese Sociolinguistics*. Eds. Patrick Heinrich and Yumiko Ohara. New York: Routledge, 2019. 3–24.

Geerts, Guido, Jef Van den Broeck and Albert Verdoodt. "Successes and Failures in Dutch Spelling Reform." In *Advances in the Creation and Revision of Writing Systems*. Ed. Joshua Fishman. The

Hague: De Gruyter, 1977. 179–245.

Heinrich, Patrick. *The Making of Monolingual Japan: Language Ideology and Japanese Modernity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2012.

Henne-Ochoa, Richard and Richard Bauman. "Who Is Responsible for Saving the Language? Performing Generation in the Face of Language Shift." In *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 25: 2 (2015): 128–149.

Henze, Paul B. "Politics and Alphabets in Inner Asia." In *Advances in the Creation and Revision of Writing Systems*. Ed. Joshua Fishman. The Hague: De Gruyter, 1977. 371–420.

Hewitt, Steve. "Breton Orthographies: An Increasingly Awkward Fit." In *Creating Orthographies for Endangered Languages*. Eds. Mari C Jones and Damien Mooney. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. 190–234.

Hogan-Brun, Gabrielle and Svitlana Melnyk. "Language policy management in the former Soviet sphere." In *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy*. Ed. Bernard Spolsky. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. 592–616.

Holbrock, Mary J. *Mayan Literacy Reinvention in Guatemala*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2016.

Hull, Kerry. "When Letters Represent More Than Sounds: Ideology versus Practicality in the Development of a Standard Orthography for Ch'orti' Mayan." In *Creating Orthographies for Endangered Languages*. Eds. Mari C Jones and Damien Mooney. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. 142–154.

Jones, Mari C. and Damien Mooney. "Creating Orthographies for Endangered Languages." In *Creating Orthographies for Endangered Languages*. Eds. Mari C. Jones and Damien Mooney. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. 1–35.

Kayano, Shigeru and Hiroshi Tanaka. *Ainu minzoku tun hanran Nibutani Damu hihan no kiroku* [*The Records of the Litigation of Two Ethnic Ainu against the Nibutani Dam*] アイヌ民族ドン叛乱二風谷ダム裁判の記録. Tokyo: Sanseido, 1999.

Kayano, Shigeru. *Kayano Shigeru no Ainu shinwa shūsei* [*Shigeru Kayano's Collections of the Stories of Gods*] 萱野茂のアイヌ神話集成. Tokyo: Victor, 1998.

Kayano, Shigeru. *Kayano Shigeru no ainugo jiten* [*Shigeru Kayano's Ainu Dictionary*] 萱野茂のアイヌ語事典. Tokyo: Sanseido, 1962, 1996.

Kayano, Shigeru. *Yasahii Ainu-go* [*Ainu Language Made Easy*] やさしいアイヌ語 (nos.1–3). Biratori, Japan: Biratori Nibutani Ainu-go Kyoshitsu, 1989–1991.

King, Kendall A. *Language Revitalization Processes and Prospects: Quichua in the Ecuadorian Andes*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 2001.

Kotei, S.I. A. “The West African Autochthonous Alphabets: An Exercise in Comparative Palaeography.” In *Advances in the Creation and Revision of Writing Systems*. Ed. Joshua Fishman. The Hague: De Gruyter, 1977. 55–73.

Labrune, Laurence. *The Phonology of Japanese*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Lüpke, Friederike. “Orthography development.” In *The Cambridge Handbook of Endangered Languages*. Eds. Peter K. Austin and Julia Sallabank. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. 312–336.

Maher, John C. “Akor Itak – Our Language, Your Language: Ainu in Japan.” In *Can threatened languages be saved?* Ed. Joshua A. Fishman. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2000. 323–349.

Maurais, Jacques. “Towards a new global linguistic order?” In *Languages in a Globalising World.* Eds. Jacques Maurais and Michael A. Morris. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 13–36.

Moseley, Christopher. “Who Owns Vernacular Literacy? Assessing the Sustainability of Written Vernaculars.” In *Creating Orthographies for Endangered Languages*. Eds. Mari C. Jones and Damien Mooney. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. 36–53.

Murchú, Máirtín Ó. “Successes and Failures in the Modernization of Irish Spelling.” In *Advances in the Creation and Revision of Writing Systems*. Ed. Joshua Fishman. The Hague: De Gruyter, 1977. 267–289.

Nagata, Hōsei. *Hokkaido Ezogo chimeikai* [*Dictionary of Place Names of Ainu Origin in Hokkaido*] 北海道蝦夷語地名解. Sapporo: Hokkaido Kyōiku Rengō Kai, 1891.

Nakagawa, Hiroshi. “Ainu-jin ni yoru Ainugo hyōki he no torikumi” [The Ainu People’s Effort to Write Ainu]「アイヌ人によるアイヌ語表記への取り組み」. In *Hyōki no shūkan no nai gengo no hyōki* [*Writing Unwritten Languages*] 表記の習慣のない言語の表記. Eds. Asako Shiohara and Shigeaki Kodama. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, 2006. 1–44.

Nakagawa, Hiroshi. *Ainugo o fiirudowaaku suru* [*Doing Fieldwork on the Ainu Language*] アイヌ語をフィールドワークする. Tokyo: Taishūkan, 1995.

Numoto, Katsuaki. “Handaku onpū shijō ni okeru tōon shiryō no ichi” [On the History of Handaku Diacritics in Reading Materials of the T’ang Dynasty]「半濁音符史上に於ける唐音資料の位置」. In *Studies in the Japanese Language* (国語学) 162 (1990): 1–12.

Osumi, Midori. “Language and Identity in Okinawa Today.” In *Studies in Japanese Bilingualism*. Eds. Mary Goebel Noguchi and Sandra Fotos. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 2001. 68–97.

Pon Fuchi (Nogami Fusako). *Ainugo wa Ikite Iru* [*The Ainu Language Lives*] アイヌ語は生きている. Tokyo: Shinshensha, 1987.

Refsing, Kirsten. “From Collecting Words to Writing Grammars: A Brief History of Ainu Linguistics.” In *Beyond Ainu Studies: Changing Academic and Public Perspectives*. Eds. Mark J. Hudson, ann-elise lewallen, and Mark K. Watson. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2014. 185–199.

Sadiqi, Fatima. “The Teaching of Amazigh (Berber) in Morocco.” In *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity: The Success-Failure Continuum in Language and Ethnic Identity Efforts Volume 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. 33–53.

Sato, Tomomi. Ezokotobairohabiki no Kenkyū [*A Study of Ezo Kotoba Irohabiki*]「蝦夷言ろは引」の研究. Sapporo: Faculty of Letters, Hokkaido University. 1995.

Sebba, Mark. “Iconisation, Attribution and Branding in Orthography.” In *Written Language & Literacy* 18: 2 (2015): 208–227.

Sebba, Mark. *Spelling and Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Sebba, Mark. “Orthography.” In *Concise Encyclopedia of Sociolinguistics*. Ed. Rajend Mesthrie. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2001. 669–672.

Seifart, Frank. “Orthography development.” In *Essentials of Language Documentation*. Ed. Jost Gippert, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann and Ulrike Mosel. Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 178. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2006. 275–299.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. *The Languages of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Spitzmüller, Jürgen. “Floating ideologies: Metamorphoses of graphic ‘Germanness’.” In *Orthography as Social Action: Scripts, Spelling, Identity and Power*. Eds. Alexandra Jaffe, Jannis Androutsopoulos, Mark Sebba, and Sally Johnson. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2012. 255–288.

Tamura, Suzuko. *Ainu-go no sekai* [*The World of the Ainu Language*] アイヌ語の世界. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kō Bunkan, 2013.

Tamura, Suzuko. “Ainu Language: Features and Relationships.” In *Ainu: Spirit of a Northern People*. Eds. William W. Fitzhugh and Chisato O. Dubreuil. Washington, DC: National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, 1999. 57–65.

Tanaka, Satoko. “Ainugo no kana hyōki no hensen” [The Transition of Kana Orthography of Ainu]「アイヌ語の仮名表記の変遷」. In *Nihon kenkyū – gengo to denshō* [*The Study of Japan: Language and Transmission*] 日本研究—言語と伝承. Ed. Susumu Ono, Koki Kinen, and Kankōkai Ronbunshū. Tokyo, Kadokawa Shoten, 1989. 367–383.

Tasuke, Yamamoto. *Itak Kashikamuy, Kotoba no rei: Ainugo no sekai* [*Itak Kashikamuy, Spirit of Words: The Ainu Word*] イタク カシカムイ (言葉の霊)—アイヌ語の世界. Sapporo: Hokkaidō Daigaku Tosho Kankōkai (Hokkaido University Press), 1991.

UNESCO (unesco.org). *UNESCO Interactive Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger*. <http://

www.unesco.org/languages-atlas/index.php> (Accessed 28 July 2020)

Unseth, Peter. “Invention of Scripts in West Africa for Ethnic Revitalization.” In *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity: The Success-Failure Continuum in Language and Ethnic Identity Efforts Volume 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. 23–32.